

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/516,557	BONNERT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael P. Barker	1626	

All Participants:

(1) Michael P. Barker.

(2) Cathy McCarty.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 16 February 2006

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

102(b); 112 1st Paragraph

Claims discussed:

1-5;7-9

Prior art documents discussed:


Luscher et al., "Deblocking of o-Nitrophenylsufenyl-Protected Peptides by Ammonium Thiocyanate and (2-Methyl-1-indolyl)acetic acid", Helv. Chim. Acta 66(2):602-605 (1983).

Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

Whether Attorney could get client's permission to amend certain claim in order to get an allowance in lieu of rejections. Applicant chose written rejections instead of an allowance.

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)